

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-9, 11-35, 37-61, and 63-68 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 28, 52, 60, and 61 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated December 11, 2007, Claims 1-9, 11-35, 37-61, and 63-68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-9, 11-35, 37-61, and 63-69 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Change to Attorney Docket Number

Please note that the Attorney Docket Number for this application is now **14917.0914USC2/ MS323349.03**.

II. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Salad for the courtesy of a telephone interview on May 28, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not render obvious the claims as currently amended. While the Examiner indicated the currently amended claims appear to overcome the cited references, the Examiner also stated that a further search is needed. No agreement was reached regarding patentability

III. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action dated December 11, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-9, 11-21, 23-35, 37-61, and 63-68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,144,991 ("*England*") in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0019825 ("*Smiga*"). Claims 1, 28, 52, 60, and 61 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "a channel manager configured to allow an end user to manage the plurality of real time chat channels, wherein the channel manager being configured to allow the end user to manage the plurality of real time chat channels comprises the channel manager being configured to allow the end user to review the plurality of real time chat channels and create additional real time chat channels." Amended Claims 28, 52, 60, and 61 each include a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least in paragraphs [0071]-[0073].

In contrast, *England* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, *England* merely discloses a "DROP Command" that is a navigating command that returns either an error number (errNum), which indicates a failure, or 0, which indicates a successful completion of the command. (See col. 27, lines 48-51.) *England* further discloses how a client leaves a session and necessary steps taken to remove the client from the session using the DROP command. (See col. 27, lines 51-54 and FIG. 29.) In *England*, the client leaves a Web page containing client-side component and the client-side component "stop" method is

called as the Web page is unloaded. (See col. 27, lines 54-57.) *England's* "stop" method is defined by Java for an applet and a client web browser calls the "stop" method when a java applet is unloaded. (See col. 27, lines 57-59.) The "stop" method in *England* issues a drop command to a piper server to deletes all resources associated with the client and closes a communication channel. (See col. 27, lines 60-63.)

Consequently, *England* merely discloses a DROP command for calling a Java applet to close a communication channel when a user leaves a web page. Therefore, *England* does not disclose an end user computing system comprising a channel manager to create and manage multiple communication channels. Rather *England* only discloses closing a communication channel when a user leaves a web page and is silent regarding creating and managing multiple communication channels.

In addition, *England* merely discloses "clients" and "guides". See col. 10, line 41.

A client is a user of a computer in a browser-based telecommunications network who, e.g., sends messages to the guide, receives messages from the guide, receives web pages and/or internet resources under control of the guide, and/or engages in a collaborative conference. See col. 10, lines 41-46. In *England*, the guide is a user of a computer in the telecommunications network who leads one or more clients by sending messages to client(s) and/or propagating web pages and/or internet resources to the client(s) for display. See col. 10, lines 46-50. A guide can coordinate collaborative tools such as a chat program, shared whiteboard, shared pointer, distributed pasteboard, and videoconferencing. See col. 10, lines 50-52. Consequently, *England* merely discloses a guide who leads clients by sending messages to clients and propagating internet resource to the clients. Therefore, *England* does not disclose an end user computing

system comprising a channel manager to create and manage multiple communication channels. Rather *England* only discloses a guide forwarding messages and propagating web pages.

Furthermore, *Smiga* does not overcome *England*'s deficiencies. *Smiga* merely discloses a natural language based information organization and collaboration tool and processing text expressions. (See paragraph [0010].) For example, in *Smiga* a relational object database defines an information object with an associated keyword, project, list, contact, date/time event or enclosure. (See paragraph [0010].) *Smiga* further discloses a parsing device for identifying the keyword in the input text expression. (See paragraph [0010].) The parsing device including functions for linking the input text expression to the information object based on the keyword identified in the input text expression. (See paragraph [0010].) Consequently, *Smiga* merely discloses a natural language based information and collaboration tool. Therefore, *Smiga* does not disclose an end user computing system comprising a channel manager to create and manage multiple communication channels. Rather *Smiga* only discloses linking text expressions to information objects in a collaboration tool and is silent regarding creating and managing multiple communication channels.

Combining *England* with *Smiga* would not have led to the claimed invention because *England* and *Smiga*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "a channel manager configured to allow an end user to manage the plurality of real time chat channels, wherein the channel manager being configured to allow the end user to manage the plurality of real time chat channels comprises the channel manager being configured to allow the end user to review the plurality of real

time chat channels and create additional real time chat channels,” as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 28, 52, 60, and 61 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 28, 52, 60, and 61 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 28, 52, 60, and 61.

Dependent Claims 2-9, 11-27, 29-35, 37-51, 53-59, and 63-68 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 28, 52, and 61, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 28, 52, and 61. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-9, 11-27, 29-35, 37-51, 53-59, and 63-68.

IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment After Final be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this amendment and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: June 11, 2008

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

